United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.20

General Assembly
Fiftieth session
Official Records

First Committee

20th Meeting
Tuesday, 14 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun ..... (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

Mr. Butler (Australia): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first occasion on which I have spoken in the First Committee under your chairmanship, let me say how very much personal pleasure it gives me to see you in the Chair.

I am grateful to you and to the Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak at this moment. My purpose is to report to you and to the Committee on consultations that have taken place since the Committee met yesterday afternoon. I propose to be as brief as possible, and at the end of this report I will put to you and to the Committee a proposed decision, on the basis of which we should be able to get on with our work expeditiously.

At the meeting of the Committee yesterday afternoon, Mr. Chairman, you drew attention to the fact that some draft resolutions had been deferred in terms of the time at which the First Committee would take action on them. Typically, you said, that had occurred because consultations were taking place with respect to those draft resolutions.

Turning to the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, it was made clear that there were no ongoing consultations on that text and that therefore, at least implicitly, there was no reason for a deferment of action upon it. Nevertheless, one delegation did indicate that it had accepted that there might be a deferment of action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, apparently because such a deferment had been considered desirable by at least one other delegation.

Now, I draw attention to the fact that in what I have said so far, two key concepts are at issue. One, deferment on the basis of consultations that were ongoing — it was acknowledged that there were no such ongoing consultations with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. In addition, "deferment" implies the existence of a notional time at which it would be appropriate to take action. There is such a time with respect to A/C.1/50/L.3, and that time was already to have begun today.

Going further in this I hope not-too-laborious narrative, another delegation immediately indicated that it had not been consulted on the action for deferment and said, as an aside, that it was not going to ask for immediate action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, thus implying that it was ready to do so, but would accept what seemed to be emerging with respect to deferment. You, Mr. Chairman, then indicated that you had in mind that that deferment should be until Friday of this week, 17 November. That seemed to bring to conclusion the exchange.

However, the floor was then subsequently taken by Ambassador Starr, of Australia, who gave a very careful report to the Committee. He indicated that while some consultations had taken place, these had not included all of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, and that under those circumstances it was of course essential that the view of the co-sponsors of the very document at issue be sought. He undertook to seek that view. He made a public announcement that there would be a meeting at 12 noon

95-86654 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

today, at a place to be specified in the *Journal*, for the purpose specifically of forming a view on the proposed timing of action on this draft resolution. That is precisely the issue, half a discussion of which had already taken place yesterday afternoon. He gave notice that a principal group of countries, a substantial group of Member States concerned with this draft resolution, would need to be consulted before they could give their agreement to a proposal for a specific date of action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

I want to record that the Chair — and we thank you for this — acknowledged the importance of having those consultations take place and expressed regret that because of pressure of time, which we all understand, they had not taken place as fully as he himself would have wanted them to. But he acknowledged the importance of those consultations to complete the circle of consultations needed in order to arrive at a decision on when — the merely procedural question — action could be agreed upon to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Now, my report to you is simple: The co-sponsors have met, as they promised they would, and they do have a view on when that deferred action — deferred from today — should be, and that is, that it should be tomorrow, 15 November.

There are a number of reasons for this. As has already been acknowledged, no further consultations are taking place on this draft resolution. It is complete; it has been before the Committee for more than two weeks. It would be normal for it to be taken in the clusters that are now being considered. The co-sponsors know of no reason for any further deferment. Deferment from today until tomorrow seems to us to be sufficient.

Finally, we are grateful to you, Sir, for the way in which you have conducted these proceedings. The discussion yesterday afternoon elucidated the matter, and it became clear that there was a need for further consultation. That has now taken place, and it has been my honour to report to you the result of that consultation. As a consequence, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3, I now propose formally to this Committee that, as a matter of procedural decision, we agree — and this should be our final decision — that action be taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, Wednesday, 15 November.

The Chairman: A specific proposal has been made by the representative of Australia.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank you, Sir, for enabling me to share with this Committee, on behalf of the European countries, our reaction to the statement just made by the representative of Australia.

We have listened very closely to what the Ambassador of Australia has said, but I should like to approach this issue from another standpoint — a fundamentally pragmatic standpoint. This different approach derives from the fact that a debate was held yesterday on the issue, which prompted many delegations, including my own, to take the view that the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 had been postponed until next Friday.

Many delegations of the European Union, including my own — which, as the Chairman is aware, is paying close attention to, and is deeply concerned by, the issue taken up in A/C.1/50/L.3 — have informed their Governments that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 would be voted on only on Friday. Thus many Foreign Ministries are operating on that assumption. In these circumstances, it is hard to imagine that the countries on whose behalf I am speaking will be in a position to take a stand tomorrow on this draft resolution.

Consequently, I would request reconsideration of this proposal, taking into account the reasons that I have just cited and all their practical implications.

Mr. Felício (Brazil): Yesterday, when you, Sir, announced that action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 would be taken on Friday, my delegation regretted that it had not taken part in the consultations that enabled you to make that proposal. I am pleased to announce, however, that you did consult the co-sponsors of the draft resolution this morning, and we consider that the discussion we are having now is a relevant and important one.

My delegation would like also to announce that it is ready to vote on the draft resolution, as soon as possible.

Our understanding is that all delegations should by now have instructions to vote on the condemnation of nuclear-test explosions and on their immediate cessation. My delegation is of the view that coherence is needed here; we hope, therefore, that all countries sharing common objectives on non-proliferation will vote in favour of

condemning nuclear-test explosions, as called for in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. Our immediate action is required.

Mr. Yarka (Papua New Guinea): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 is the result of many days of consultations conducted by the core group representing almost all regions, and we were pleased when the draft was submitted to this Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. The draft has therefore been with the Committee for some time, as indicated by Ambassador Butler of Australia, and within this time-frame, no delegation has requested amendments or further consultations to accommodate elements of interest to them.

Like other co-sponsors, my delegation expected action to be taken on this draft today. However, since the announcement yesterday evening that a particular delegation had sought deferment on the draft, we all were upset and could not come to terms with the explanation given. We did, however, appreciate your explanation that it was physically impossible yesterday for you, Sir, to consult all co-sponsors on A/C.1/50/L.3 concerning the request for deferment.

If a particular delegation had any proposals concerning, or amendments to be made to, this draft resolution, this unfortunately was not brought to the attention of the co-sponsors in the three- week period since the draft was introduced. Why should action on A/C.1/50/L.3 unnecessarily be delayed when there are no current or proposed consultations to be conducted on this draft? We believe that the opponents of this draft resolution and their supporters are simply trying to mislead this Committee, and derail its work. We would urge the Committee to seriously consider the proposal submitted by the Ambassador of Australia.

Before the meeting closed yesterday, Ambassador Starr of Australia informed this Committee that the co-sponsors would meet this morning to hear views on what we could do to bring the date for action on this draft resolution forward. As indicated by Ambassador Butler, the co-sponsors decided this morning, and once again this afternoon, to take action on this draft — not on Friday, as requested by the opponents of the draft resolution, but tomorrow.

Furthermore, it is also our understanding that you, Sir, want the Committee to complete action on all disarmament issues this week. We believe that since other draft resolutions are being discussed — to which further amendments are being made and on which consultations are continuing — we need to direct our efforts and energies to those, instead of deliberately delaying a draft resolution that has no amendments and on which no further consultations are scheduled.

Therefore, I should like the Committee to take into account the comments made here, and my delegation would urge it also to take action on A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, and not complicate the work of this Committee by deferrals that serve no good purpose.

Mr. Leung (Fiji): After the lucid and accurate summation by Ambassador Butler of Australia, it is my respectful suggestion or recommendation that we act on his proposal. As a member of the group of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, I may say that the necessary consultation process has taken place, our views were solicited and our clear expression of opinion is that the deferment should continue only as far as tomorrow.

It is my delegation's view, therefore, that in these circumstances Ambassador Butler's eminently reasonable proposal should be accepted.

Mr. Amar (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): As the representative of Spain has so cogently said, and following the Chairman's statement yesterday, I think we should respect the decision of the Chair and defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 until Friday. My Ministry is informed of the date, and it would be difficult to inform my authorities today of any further change of date.

A representative has referred to the draft resolution as condemning nuclear testing. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 does not speak of condemnation. It merely "strongly deplores".

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the opinion of Uruguay there was no discussion of this issue yesterday. We simply stated that there had been a request on the part of one delegation that the matter be deferred until Friday. There can hardly have been a discussion when no delegation in the room suggested that there should be a postponement. It was agreed that consultations were going to be held with the co-sponsors to determine when that statement was going to be taken into account.

As we understand it, those consultations were held and the co-sponsors have expressed the wish that action should be taken on the draft resolution tomorrow. My delegation

is even prepared to vote on the draft resolution today, if necessary.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I just wondered if I might ask for a clarification from the co-sponsors. We have heard that they want to vote tomorrow, and I just wonder if they could explain why it is that they want to change the decision the Chairman made. One would have the impression, perhaps, that they are running scared and that they think that their support is evaporating.

Mr. Butler (Australia): I think all of the sponsors of the draft resolution are very grateful to the Committee for the hearing that has been given it in these few moments this afternoon — a hearing on a matter of profound importance to all of the co-sponsors. I would like to respond on their behalf to one or two of the points that have been made and end with an appeal to our colleagues for cooperation.

First of all, the representative of Spain, speaking on behalf, I think, of members of the European Union, and presumably the United Kingdom as one such member, indicated that there would be difficulty in informing Governments of a change of date. With deepest respect to him and to his colleagues, I must say that what in fact he is putting to us is, that it would be difficult to inform capitals that the advice provided last night was in fact erroneous — wrong — because it was very clear last night that the matter was not settled. That is precisely why the co-sponsors indicated last night that there would be a further meeting and that the outcome of that meeting would be respectfully reported to the Committee, as has been done today. It is very difficult to accept that the co-sponsors could or should be held responsible for an error of this kind, that is, informing Governments of a decision that was not final, that was only in process and under continuing consideration.

Secondly, with respect to the text itself, there have been some implications that there is perhaps something new in it or that it requires further study. I make the very obvious point that this text bears the symbol A/C.1/50/L.3. It is therefore one of the very first of the proposals lodged with the Committee for decision. I am well aware that that does not mean that it is to be taken third, but those numbers are allocated as the texts are submitted. This one was submitted on 31 October and it has been available in precisely its present form in all languages since 2 November. It bears the symbol A/C.1/50/L.3. Its content is well known.

Another delegation spoke of the inconvenience of a change of dates. Dates are frequently changed in this Committee. It is not a new phenomenon. In respect to this particular draft resolution, we have been doing what we normally do, which is to enter into consultation about the date on which it would be agreed or considered appropriate for action to take place. The co-sponsors are of the firm view that that appropriate point of action, although it involves a deferment, is tomorrow, and that is why they have made that submission.

Finally, with respect to the question posed by the representative of the United Kingdom, who ended by asking, "Why do we want to change a decision that was taken yesterday?" I can only repeat what I said at the beginning to the representative of Spain, namely: there was not a final decision yesterday. We began a process of arriving at a decision, which was never to have been complete until the co-sponsors had met. We are not proposing a change in something that was advanced yesterday. We are completing the process that was started yesterday and advising our view of what would be an appropriate date. With respect to the other part of his statement — the humorous part — I think he got his answer when the room laughed.

Now, I would hope that members of the Committee will take into account what the co-sponsors of this text have said. I hope that, in my attempt to provide some courteous reply to questions that have been raised, at what I have said this afternoon will have been heard. I end with the appeal to our colleagues in the Committee to accept our proposal that we defer action on this draft resolution from today until tomorrow; that this be our final decision on this matter and that all have been able to advise their Foreign Ministries immediately — this afternoon, tonight — that action will take place on this text — which has been before the Committee for two weeks and on which there are no further consultations — that action, will take place, by voting, tomorrow. I hope the Committee can accept that proposal of a procedural nature now, and without a vote. Then we can resume our work and take action tomorrow on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: My delegation would like clarification on a few points related to the matter under discussion.

The first concerns document A/C.1/50/2/Rev.1, issued on 27 October 1995, which contains the proposed programme of work and timetable. In it, delegations were informed that action would be taken on all draft resolutions

submitted under agenda items 57 to 81 between Thursday, 9 November, and Monday, 20 November 1995. My delegation would like to believe that all delegations transmitted this proposed programme of work and timetable to their foreign ministries and that therefore those ministries are very well aware that we are now at the decision-making stage, which began last Friday.

Secondly, I wish to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the document circulated by the Chairman on 9 November, which included his suggested programme for the taking of action. In that suggested programme there are 11 clusters. The first cluster relates to nuclear weapons and the first draft resolution in that cluster is A/C.1/50/L.3. The draft resolution was introduced and circulated on 31 October. No revisions have been submitted and no consultations on the draft have taken place. All ministries concerned have known this for two weeks now and this should have provided plenty of time for delegations to receive their instructions.

There is no reason for postponement except to accommodate one delegation. For reasons of courtesy the Committee agreed to defer taking a decision and agreed that instead of voting on it today it would do so tomorrow.

We have been asked why we want to vote on this now. I should like to turn this question around, and ask: what reason is there for waiting? No consultations are taking place. Everyone has, or should have, received instructions. The programme is clear. It is the first draft resolution of the first cluster. What grounds are there for waiting any longer? The only reason we have been given is that yesterday we were told of a supposed decision — which in fact was not taken — and we informed our foreign ministries accordingly. I think it was wrong to bring to the attention of our foreign ministries something that did not take place. We are not at fault on this.

But what other reason could there be for postponing action? Could it be that some delegations think that if action is taken on Friday afternoon there would be no repercussions in the world press since the next day is Saturday? What political purpose is behind this attempt at postponement?

My delegation is ready to vote today. Out of courtesy we agreed to do so tomorrow, but we are ready to vote at any point.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I have listened to the debate with great interest because I am a lawyer and it is always nice to be present at a legal fight. I also welcome Ambassador Butler, who is an old United Nations hand in the First Committee, and we like to hear him tell the story of the First Committee.

Apparently, he is one of the more knowledgeable people in the Committee in so far as procedural matters are concerned and therefore he knows full well that in years past we had specific difficulties with some draft resolutions — texts were not ready or, from the political standpoint, we were not ready to vote on them, and so they were deferred to the last minute. The normal time for such draft resolutions to be voted on was the Friday of the last full week — and this is what is happening here.

I must also say that my understanding of what happened yesterday is slightly different from that of the Australian delegation. As far as I am concerned, there was a ruling by the Chairman yesterday that the vote would be deferred to Friday and that decision was accepted.

The German delegation has no problem and is ready to vote on the draft resolution now, and, as the representative of Mexico has pointed out, everybody should have received instructions by now, but not everybody's organization is as orderly as the Mexican State and therefore some of us are not as ready as he is.

I know for a fact that some European delegations simply have not yet been instructed on how to vote. It is our fault of course — the fault of those delegations, but that is the fact and such facts used to be taken into account by the Committee, so I do not quite understand why there is such a hurry. When we accepted the programme of work I remember distinctly that flexibility was built in — that it was decided that if the Chairman receives a request for postponement then the decision should be postponed.

Therefore, as I have stated, my delegation is ready to vote on the draft resolution at any time, but I think we should be courteous as proposed by Mr. de Icaza and wait for those who are not ready to vote and give them a chance to participate in the vote in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like briefly to pick up on some points made by the representative of Australia although I would point out that my intention is not to get into a dispute with him. We have listened very attentively to what he has said.

There are two points that I wish to make. The first is that Australia has asserted that this is a matter of great importance to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

I would like to add that I think it is a matter of genuine importance to all delegations here, and therefore the points of view of all delegations should be taken into account, not just those of the sponsors. When I first spoke on this matter, I approached it pragmatically, because, as I said, I do not want to get involved in an argument about whether the decision we had the impression was taken yesterday was right or wrong — or about whether that impression was right or wrong. It was an impression that many delegations shared, and many delegations acted accordingly. In the light of this situation, those delegations have the right to have their views taken into account, although I shall not offer my opinion of whether this was erroneous or not.

Finally, I want to assure my friend the representative of Mexico that the concern not to vote on this draft resolution tomorrow is not a concern of one delegation alone; it is shared by a large number of delegations, which I shall not list now.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I have been listening attentively to the discussion of whether or not the Committee should proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. The Chinese delegation would have no objection to voting right now, because my delegation opposes the draft resolution: it determined its position long ago.

I was pleased to learn that the sponsors are fully prepared for a vote on this draft resolution. But as far as we know, this does not mean that all other countries are equally prepared. Some delegations have probably not yet received instructions from their capitals.

The Chinese delegation hopes that members will recall that all countries are equal, sovereign States, whether or not they are sponsors of this draft resolution. No country has the right to pressure other countries. China does not wish to use the vote as a means of exerting pressure on any other country. Nor does China wish to be pressured itself from any quarter, from any group of countries. China has always considered that there is no point in pressuring anyone: it is always counterproductive.

The debate yesterday and today shows that it would be premature to vote on this draft resolution tomorrow. I consider this draft resolution to be an important one, and it is only normal for countries to want to consider their positions on it. While a country may consider its position to be correct and just, it should not claim that this position has priority: if the position has merit, it will be supported by all. There is nothing to fear in that regard. This is not to say that the majority view is always correct.

The Chairman: Since we do not have a great deal of time and since we must deal with a number of draft resolutions this afternoon, I would like to propose that, with the Committee's assent, we deal with this issue right away.

Mr. Kantola (Finland): We fully agree with what was said in this context by the representatives of Spain and of Germany. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 is an important one, which is being considered at a high political level. We should show some respect to that fact. I appeal to the sponsors not to insist that the Committee take action on this draft resolution tomorrow.

Mr. Butler (Australia): Mr. Chairman, you were about to propose action — which I and the other sponsors support your doing. But in the light of the appeal that has just been made and of other comments that have been made in the past 10 minutes, I would like to say one more thing. The question has been asked of the sponsors, "What is the hurry?". If you ask the wrong question, you get the wrong answer. It is not the right question. We have simply said one thing; it is not a question of whether we are in a hurry or not. We have said that this draft resolution is ready. It is the distinction between something that is ready and something that is not. Therefore, the concept of being in a hurry does not arise.

Under those circumstances, I respectfully submit that the onus of proof is not upon those who are ready, but upon those who want delay.

Finally, it is simply not true that a decision was taken yesterday. A process was started yesterday which would involve further consultation leading to a procedural decision. I have reported, on behalf of the sponsors, on the outcome of that consultation; we now formally propose — we earnestly hope and appeal that we can do this without a procedural vote — that because we are ready we take a decision now to the effect that we will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow, 15 November.

Mr. Vattani (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): The position of the Italian delegation was set out in the excellent statement by our colleague from Spain.

We are convinced that the vote on such a sensitive draft resolution as that contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 requires that all delegations have time to reflect deeply, that they may convey to this room opinions from their Governments that have been well thought out and that take everyone's considerations into account.

I do not feel that hasty action on this draft resolution would be the best way to proceed. I simply wish to reassure any colleagues who may feel that this request for extra time comes from one delegation alone that the Italian delegation would also be very happy to have more time before we take a decision on this text.

Mr. Mernier (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I do not intend to repeat what has been said — and very well said — by our colleagues from Spain and Germany. I simply wish to point out that this text is of particular importance to my delegation and that, whether or not its co-sponsors have thought it through, my delegation has not.

The decision that was adopted yesterday — and we consider that it was indeed adopted yesterday — was communicated to my Government, which is formulating its position with a view to a vote on Friday. We believe that, on such an important issue, we cannot ignore the difficulties that any delegation may be experiencing. We do not feel that there is any hurry nor do we see any grounds for haste.

The Chairman: I should like to propose that the representative of the Netherlands be the last speaker in this debate and that we then take action on the proposal made by the representative of Australia. I hope that the Committee will agree to that, because unless we do that we will not be able to finish our work on time. I call on the representative of Djibouti, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Dorani (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): I apologize for speaking on a point of order, but I must confess that the current atmosphere reminds me of the times of the cold war — and yet, the two blocs no longer exist. There is only one bloc now, and I would say without meaning to be provocative that we are all in the same boat.

Why, then, are we bent on voting on Wednesday when you, Sir, adopted a decision yesterday? I repeat, this was not a proposal on your part, but a decision. Moreover, consultations do not usually take place between the co-sponsors of a text and those delegations most concerned. There is a silent majority that needs to be respected. That majority includes 150 members and discussions go on within it —

The Chairman: The representative of Djibouti asked to speak on a point of order and he must make one. But he is making a statement. I will have to ask him to stop speaking unless he wishes to continue on a point of order.

Mr. Dorani (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): To conclude, we have faith in your wisdom and skill, Sir. We wish to recall here — and this is my most important point — that a decision was adopted yesterday and no one reacted to that decision that the draft resolution would be put to the vote on Friday.

Mr. Ramaker (Netherlands): Like others, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate, not least because my delegation has a particular interest in it. First of all, of course, I entirely agree with what the Spanish Ambassador said on behalf of the European Union when, on two occasions, he stated that it was the Union's desire that you, Sir, would abide by the ruling you made yesterday that we would take action on this particular draft resolution this coming Friday.

The way we have been proceeding in this Committee thus far under your guidance has been very good, I believe. Once the dates were announced in document A/C.1/50/2/Rev.1, page 2 — the dates that were referred to by the Ambassador of Mexico a little while ago — we have tried at each meeting to determine on which draft resolutions we could take action and on which we had yet to wait a little while.

As far as the action on draft resolutions is concerned, in the document that I quote — and that of course is known to my Government — the time period for taking action on the draft resolutions, including the one in document A/C.1/50/L.3, extends from 9 to 20 November. I think that we must take into account that our principals, who indeed attach a great deal of importance to this draft resolution, would have taken this into account when they determined their calendars.

I, like others, would like to inform this Committee that my Government attaches a great deal of importance indeed to this draft resolution. I agree with those who say that we should already have our final instructions, but as sometimes happens with our principals, we do not have final instructions and therefore we, like others, are one of those delegations that would like to appeal to the usual flexibility of this Committee, which has also been applied

to other draft resolutions, that we may simply have this draft resolution — which is among the more difficult ones — placed a little further along in our schedule of work, as is usually done. I think that this is totally normal.

I must say that I have made known bilaterally to the Australian delegation the concern about the practical problems that we face. I am a little bit surprised — and I am sure that The Hague will be surprised — that, in the framework of those friendly relations we have with that country, we now find ourselves on opposite sides of the fence. I understand that, of course, Australia speaks on behalf of a group of delegations. Nevertheless, to that group of delegations I would like to appeal — and my appeal is very much along the lines of what our colleague from Finland has just said — that it show the necessary flexibility in order to allow some of us to face the practical problems that we have.

I do not think there is anything sinister in all of this. All of us will have to make, or have already made, responsible, well-founded decisions on this draft resolution. We think this is a most important issue. For my part, I too would like to appeal for the flexibility that is usual in this Committee on these matters. Yesterday, Sir, I think you sensed that this flexibility was present, and you abided by tradition. And, as far as I know — and it was not to everybody's liking — it was accepted that we would take action on Friday.

I think my delegation and others are making a perfectly reasonable appeal, and do not think that there should be any particular problem with it, given the way this Committee usually works.

The Chairman: I appeal again to delegations to refrain from making statements at this stage.

Mr. Nsanze (Burundi) *(interpretation from French):* My delegation rarely intervenes and rarely tries to break the monopoly held by other delegations, but the Committee is at a crossroads. We have listened to the divergent positions of other delegations, stated with what approaches intransigence. It will be necessary for all parties to become more flexible with a view to reaching a compromise. While we are aware that the text has been discussed at great length and that the majority of delegations may be ready to take a decision, my delegation is among those that would propose that the vote be deferred. It does not seem right to insist on forcing a position that could lead some delegations to reject the draft resolution before the Committee. All this, plus the team spirit that is supposed to reign in the Committee, would favour deferring action on the draft resolution to a later date — but preferably as close as possible — so that all delegations can receive instructions from their capitals. Given the great importance of the matter, all delegations should have the opportunity to consult their Governments on final, well-thought-out positions.

The Chairman: The delegation of Australia has made a specific proposal. The Chair understands that there is a disagreement as to whether action should be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 tomorrow or on Friday. I propose that we proceed to vote on the proposal made by the representative of Australia.

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I wonder if we could have a reaction to the appeal that has been made by a number of delegations to the sponsors to abide by what has become the practice in this Committee, that we agree on the timing of decisions. We are making a departure from this. I would ask for an answer to that and, while I am about it, an answer to the question that I put earlier: Why all the rush? We have wasted most of the afternoon; why do we not just proceed as originally agreed?

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to suspend the meeting for a few minutes to enable me to consult with other members of the European Union to define our position on this matter.

The Chairman: In response to the request by the representative of Spain, I shall now suspend the meeting for a few minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.35 p.m.

The Chairman: After intensive consultations with the delegations concerned, I am happy to report that there is a consensus that the Committee take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 on Thursday afternoon as the first item, at 3 p.m. sharp. If I hear no objection, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I should like to thank all delegations for their spirit of understanding and cooperation.

At that meeting, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

In cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 and L.39/Rev.1;

In cluster 3: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1;

In cluster 6: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33;

In cluster 7: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1;

In cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

In cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.18 and L.20/Rev.1.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I see there are none. I shall therefore call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Before we proceed to action, I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1: Cyprus;

A/C.1/50/L.7: Belgium and the United States of America;

A/C.1/50/L.3: Jamaica;

A/C.1/50/L.9: France, India and Mauritius;

A/C.1/50/L.11: Guinea, Mali and Myanmar;

A/C.1/50/L.13: Nicaragua;

A/C.1/50/L.14: Belarus, Cape Verde, Cyprus and Latvia;

A/C.1/50/L.15: Belarus, Cyprus and Kazakstan;

A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1: Germany;

A/C.1/50/L.16: Islamic Republic of Iran;

A/C.1/50/L.18: Papua New Guinea;

A/C.1/L.19: Malaysia;

A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1: Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/50/L.33: Malaysia and Papua New Guinea;

A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1: Czech Republic, Iceland and Poland;

A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1: Botswana, France, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Sudan and Swaziland;

A/C.1/50/L.38: Bangladesh, Djibouti and New Zealand;

A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1: Malaysia;

A/C.1/50/L.40: Djibouti;

A/C.1/50/L.42: Cyprus and Malaysia; and

A/C.1/50/L.43: Albania, Czech Republic and France.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions or votes on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that are sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, I wish to make a very slight revision to this draft. In operative paragraph 1, before the words "and the exchange of documents", we wish to introduce the following words: "including the Protocol to that Treaty, signed in Lisbon by the parties on 23 May 1992".

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and the following countries that are associating themselves with it — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland and

Romania and Slovakia. For the first time this year, all the States members of the European Union will be abstaining on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The European Union continues to attach importance to negative security assurances, but we take the view that its support cannot be given to a text that simply repeats General Assembly resolution 49/73 with only a few small changes. Many significant developments that were favourably welcomed by the European Union have taken place in the area covered by this agenda item. The Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 984 (1995), and declarations were made by the nuclear-weapon States concerning both negative and positive security assurances.

At the Review and Extension Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) held last May, the States parties to the NPT agreed, without a vote, that further steps should be considered to assure non-nuclear-weapon States party to the NPT against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Those steps could take the form of an internationally binding legal instrument.

The draft resolution also fails to make any mention of the need for reciprocal commitments concerning non-proliferation on the part of the recipients of the security assurances. This important development takes on particular significance from the standpoint of the indefinite extension of the NPT.

The Chairman: Would there be any other delegation wishing to speak at this stage?

If there are none, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested. Also a separate recorded vote on preambular paragraph 7 has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will take action first on the separate vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation and the United States of America. It is sponsored by the following States: Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey and the United States of America.

The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 116 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 15th meeting, on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Viet Nam.

The Committee will now proceed to take action by recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala,

Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Swaziland

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted by 113 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Swaziland advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain on the draft resolution.]

The Chairman: As the Committee may recall, yesterday the Committee agreed to take up also draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 but thereafter the Chair received a request to defer action on this draft resolution to a later date. I understand that the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.44 wish to take this draft resolution at this meeting. May I inquire from the co-sponsors of the draft resolution whether this is the case.

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: It was indicated yesterday that action would be taken today on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.44. For this reason we assumed that, just as the Committee voted today on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, so it would vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, which deals with the same matter.

The Chairman: Is the Committee ready to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44?

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States delegation is not ready to vote on this draft resolution. A short time ago you, Mr. Chairman, ruled that we would take only draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35 and A/C.1/50/L.39 from cluster 1. My delegation heard a proposed amendment just about 10 minutes ago, and we too are thinking about proposing an amendment. In these circumstances we should very much like to have more time for consultations.

The Chairman: Does the representative of Colombia agree that, since an oral amendment has been proposed, there is a need for further consultations with a view to arriving at consensus on the draft resolution?

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: In fact, our amendment was presented orally for the specific purpose of saving the Committee's time and to enable us to take action on this draft resolution as soon as possible. However, if it is felt that more time is required — if one delegation feels that the decision should be put off until tomorrow — we have no objection to that course, bearing in mind the fact that an amendment has been proposed orally.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Colombia for his cooperation. Action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44 will be taken tomorrow.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I should like to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, on security assurances.

The delegation of Australia is a serious and consistent advocate of the pursuit of more satisfactory and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. My delegation has been active in the pursuit of

this high-priority goal. We chaired productive discussions on the subject at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which took place earlier this year. We have also put forward our own concrete ideas and proposals.

Because of this serious-minded commitment to an objective that we believe is worthwhile and attainable, my delegation has for the last three years joined Canada and New Zealand in urging on the States that are traditionally the joint sponsors of this draft resolution a number of fundamental changes that are required to reflect reality. Australia's support for what we regarded as an increasingly deficient text was subject to the understanding that some effort would be made in the following year to address our concerns. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

My delegation has repeatedly stressed the necessary link between security assurances and acceptance by the beneficiary States of unambiguous and internationally verified nuclear-non-proliferation commitments. It is not reasonable for any State to expect to benefit from security assurances if it is not itself willing to contribute to ensuring the nuclear security of others by subscribing to the international non-proliferation regime.

As I noted last year, the overwhelming majority of States have displayed such commitment by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or to regional non-proliferation accords of comparable scope, or to both. There is no doubt as to the nuclear reassurance that they have extended to others. They are demonstrably and verifiably non-nuclear-weapon States.

My Government therefore finds it disappointing that sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39 were apparently unable to accept even a cross-reference to the contribution made to enhanced international security by the continuing strict adherence of non-nuclear-weapon States to multilateral and legally binding non-proliferation undertakings that are verified by full-scope nuclear safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

More important, we find it deeply troubling that, apparently, even the barest of cross-references to important, relevant outcomes of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference could not be considered for inclusion. We view the agreement struck by the 175 States participating in the Review and Extension Conference, and subscribed to by all five nuclear-weapon States — agreement that was recorded in the Conference's decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament — as an important milestone. That agreement states that further steps should be considered to assure non-nuclear-weapon States party to the Treaty against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, it being recognized that such steps could take the form of an internationally legally binding instrument.

For ourselves — indeed, we believe, for all but a handful of the States represented in this room — these are important undertakings. We wish to see them given the prominence that they warrant, for we firmly expect them to be the basis of determined action by the nuclear-weapon States in the future.

Because of the resistance to the inclusion of such fundamental points, Australia's decision to continue its support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1 was made most reluctantly. We appeal to the sponsors to amend their approach next year so that it will accord with the new situation in which we find ourselves and with the commitments and aspirations of the vast majority of delegations represented here.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The delegation of Argentina wishes to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1, which the Committee has just adopted.

Argentina's position on this draft resolution derives from the fact that it does not sufficiently reflect the headway that has been made in this area over the years. I am thinking in particular of the second decision taken at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and of Security Council resolution 984 (1995), which was adopted unanimously.

The declaration subscribed to by the nuclear-weapon States is regarded as a very positive step. All such measures help directly to strengthen security in the international community, and they underscore the fact that we are entering into a genuine process of nuclear disarmament.

Because of the wording of the text, Argentina was unable to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Ms. Ghose (India): My delegation joined those that were abstaining in respect of the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1. I do not suppose that anyone was surprised at our abstention.

Our views on the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) have been stated several times already during this session of the General Assembly, and I do not intend to repeat those views. However, I can say that we do not view with appreciation the indefinite extension of the NPT.

Our abstention on the draft resolution as a whole was necessitated by the fact that while we recognize and welcome the steps that are being taken by the nuclear-weapon States towards disarmament, we feel that the situation is not quite as bright as is portrayed here. We do feel that there is a need for the nuclear-weapon States to move even more purposefully towards the goal of ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons and that we as non-nuclear-weapon States should be aware of what exactly is going on.

I would like to make a very brief comment on some of the comments made both before and after the vote on A/C.1/50/L.39. My delegation has noted with great interest that non-nuclear-weapon States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will now, according to the reasoning put forward both by the delegations of Spain and Australia, look after their own defence.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. We understand the desire of States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Nuclear Weapons that are non-nuclear-weapon States to have definite assurances of the non-use of any nuclear weapons against them. Unfortunately, the draft resolution on this subject does not take sufficient account of the positive significance of the measures already undertaken along these lines and of the important contribution to the strengthening of international security made by the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 984 (1995) of 11 April 1995, which guarantees the security of non-nuclear States. Nor does it take sufficient account of the agreed statement of the nuclear-weapon States on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States participating in the NPT. In this context, an important step was taken towards agreeing on a common approach on the part of nuclear-weapon States on this issue. Russia, as well as other nuclear-weapon States, feels that guarantees have to be provided to non-nuclear States that are parties to the NPT. This will possibly provide for future agreement: on the one hand, the international legal obligation not to possess nuclear weapons, and on the other hand, the assurances on non-use. These are the most important elements and they have been omitted from draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.39/Rev.1. Therefore, it is hard to imagine how this kind of resolution can serve to promote progress towards a solution to the specific problem at the Conference on Disarmament. At the same time, we would like to confirm our support for the working out of legally binding security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT and for the renewal to that end of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chairman: Owing to the lateness of the hour, the Committee will have to continue its work tomorrow. The Chair will call on the rest of the speakers tomorrow morning. As you may very well recall, we still have a number of draft resolutions that were supposed to have been taken up this afternoon. Those draft resolutions will be taken up as the first order of business tomorrow.

May we now go through the other draft resolutions in the various clusters on which we may also take action tomorrow morning.

In cluster 1, we will take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1.

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44, which was introduced by Colombia on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, we wish very particularly to request the Chair to include that draft resolution for action tomorrow.

The Chairman: Yes, of course. Actually, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 figures as the first item for tomorrow morning.

In cluster 2, I wonder whether the Committee would be ready to take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1. I see no objections, so we will also take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1.

In cluster 4, we can take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40 tomorrow. I see no objections.

In cluster 8, we could take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.27, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.48 tomorrow morning. As there appears to be no objection, it is so agreed.

Mr. Moher (Canada): This is not to raise questions about draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48, but draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 deals with the same subject-matter. We had requested that when A/C.1/50/L.48 came up for action, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 would also come forward. I am not saying this to disagree: I am merely suggesting that this one be added.

The Chairman: May we include A/C.1/50/L.13?

It was so decided.

The Chairman: We turn now to draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.23 and A/C.1/50/L.25 in cluster 11. If I hear no objection, we will take action on A/C.1/50/L.23 and A/C.1/50/L.25 tomorrow morning.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I have been informed by the Secretariat that we can take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 only if the programme budget implications are ready. It seems that they are not ready and that they may not be ready tomorrow. Therefore it will not be possible to take up that draft resolution tomorrow.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I thought that we had asked whether, with the agreement of the lead co-sponsor, it would be possible to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): We have the same point.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): We wanted to speak to make the same point as the representative of the United Kingdom. It had also been our understanding that this draft resolution would be considered towards the end.

The Chairman: Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23 will therefore be taken up at a later stage.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, the revised text will be published tomorrow. Because of the 24-hour rule, it will be proper to allow one day, I believe. I would therefore suggest that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 be taken up on Thursday.

The Chairman: I think that this is a reasonable suggestion. We will therefore not take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 tomorrow.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I understand that we have, of course, several draft resolutions left over that we were supposed to act on today. Would it be possible for the Secretariat to give us a list of all the draft resolutions on which we will be taking action tomorrow?

The Chairman: Tomorrow morning we are going to take up the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1; in cluster 2: A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40 —

Mr. Ramaker (Netherlands): While I support the request made by the Ambassador of Pakistan to give us a list, I did understand that we would first finish the business that was left over this afternoon and that we would then go on with the list you have been reading, Sir. You are now mixing the clusters. I think it would be easier if you could give us the chronological order and then the others.

The Chairman: That would be fine. In cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.44/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1; in cluster 6: A/C.1/50/L.33; in cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1; in cluster 8: A/C.1/50/L.12; in cluster 10: A/C.1/50/L.9 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30; and in cluster 11: A/C.1/50/L.18 and A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1.

Then, in cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1; in cluster 2: A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1; in cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.34 —

I should like to ask representatives whether the Committee would be ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34?

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would be grateful if a decision on that particular draft resolution could be deferred to Thursday to allow for some consultations with its co-sponsors.

The Chairman: It is so agreed.

In cluster 4: A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40; in cluster 8: A/C.1/50/L.27, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.13 and A/C.1/50/L.48 —

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I wonder if it would be possible for the delegation of Colombia to agree to take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1 on Thursday. I do not think that my delegation will be in a position to vote on it tomorrow. I would be very grateful if that could be done.

Mr. García (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: We would be prepared to have this draft resolution taken up on Thursday.

The Chairman: It is so agreed.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): It seems to me that when we first checked the draft resolutions, we decided that we would also decide on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 in cluster 1 tomorrow. Is that correct or was there another decision?

The Chairman: The representative of Myanmar has proposed that since the revision will be issued tomorrow, it would be appropriate for the Committee to allow time for consideration by delegations.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) *(interpretation from Russian)*: I asked to speak earlier when we were discussing the order in which draft resolutions would be considered tomorrow. I should like some clarification.

As I understood it, it was proposed that we would take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.1 tomorrow. As far as I know, the text of this draft resolution has an additional amendment. It is our understanding that it will appear in A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2. Is that correct?

The Chairman: Yes, there will be a Rev.2. We have already agreed which draft resolutions will be taken up tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.